

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/893,016	06/28/2001	Viet Nguyen	N.C.82,338	8118	
26384	7590 05/11/2004		EXAMINER		
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY			SIEFKE, SAMUEL P		
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS) CODE 1008.2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W.			1743		
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20375-5320		DATE MAILED: 05/11/2004	DATE MAILED: 05/11/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/893,016	NGUYEN ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Samuel P Siefke	1743				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess			
THE - Exte afte - If th - If NO - Fail Any	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comr D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status		•					
1)[	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3)□	<del>"</del> " —						
Dianacit		x parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 45	5 O.G. 215.				
· ·	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.						
5)[∑]	<ul> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) ☐ Claim(s) 3 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 4 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) ☐ Claim(s) 3 and 5-11 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
·							
8)							
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	•					
	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(a).	-(d) or (f)				
_	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority and the events. 3 176(a)	(4) 01 (1).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
	$3.\square$ Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	d in this National Sta	age			
	application from the International Bureau	, ,,					
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not received	<b>i</b> . ,				
Attachmen 	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	<b>Ω</b> □	DTG 440)				
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Dal					
3) 🔲 inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa		(2)			

Application/Control Number: 09/893,016

Art Unit: 1743

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobgood et al. (USPN 3,847,552).

Hobgood discloses an apparatus for measuring quantitatively the presence of a plurality of atmospheric pollutants that comprises dry reagents deposited on permeable carrying means that are located perpendicular to a flow through tube, a sealed chamber, a pump that pulls ambient air through the permeable filter discs.

Hobgood does not teach using a pump at the inlet of the flow through tube.

Placing a pump at the inlet to push air through the tube is equivalent to pulling air through the tube by placing the pump at the outlet of the tube. Therefore it would have been obvious to modified Hobgood to use a sampling pump at the inlet of the chamber

Art Unit: 1743

and the outlet of the chamber in order to provide a more efficient air flow through the chamber by providing with a steady air stream at both input and output.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 is allowed.

Claims 2, 5-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, and 5-11 would be allowable because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a using multiple valves as the input.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel P Siefke whose telephone number is 571-272-1262. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam P. Siefke

May 3, 2004

Maureen M. Wallenhorst
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200